

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's response to arguments per the Office action of October 3, 2003, and believes that the Examiner has misunderstood the amended claims.

Claim 1, as amended, requires movement of the weight along the rotational axis of the gantry. Unless the Applicant is mistaken, Yokogawa teaches only radial movement of the weights.

Claim 20 requires one weight that is movable along two axes per the present invention's Fig. 3. Applicant's review of Fig. 3 of the Yokogawa reference appears to show one a weight movable only along only a single axis.

Applicant believes that these differences are fundamental and nonobvious in light of the Yokogawa reference, and that give the fundamental difference between Yokogawa and the invention as claimed, that a §102 rejection cannot be sustained.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned if the Examiner believes that a change in the wording of the claims would make this distinction clearer.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW A. HALSMER

By: 

Keith M. Baxter
Reg. No. 31,233
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5719